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Background
Oral health status and treatment for individuals with intellectual or developmental disability (I/DD) is a significant public health disparity. The population with I/DD experience poorer oral hygiene, higher prevalence and greater severity of periodontal disease, as well as a greater incidence of untreated caries. In year 1 of the systematic review, the literature was searched and screened for inclusion in the review and data extraction. The objective of year 2 of the systematic review is to examine the literature in depth.

Methods

Key Questions
KQ1: What effective interventions/strategies exist to improve access to oral health care for the I/DD population?
KQ2: What effect do interventions that support good oral health behaviors have on improved oral health care for the I/DD population?

A robust search of on-line data bases such as PubMed, along with gray literature sites, was conducted. The search included any literature from 1990 to 2013 with an emphasis on the review and data extraction. The objective of year 2 of the systematic review is to examine the literature in depth.

Data extraction was conducted using an electronic repository, the Systematic Review Data Repository (SRDR). The study team tailored the extraction tool to address specific Key Questions.

Study Quality is being assessed in a 2 phase process, examining external and internal validity: Expert clinicians conducted an assessment of the evidence with a consideration of the execution and relevance to clinical practice. Methodologists are conducting further quality review on design suitability, number of studies available, consistency of findings, effect size, and whether expert opinion was used.

Summary
Once inclusion/exclusion criteria were applied, oral health interventions were grouped into four topic areas to facilitate review and structured extraction of data. Interventions and Outcomes varied significantly across topic areas. Less than half received a quality rating of “good” by clinical expert reviewers, emphasizing a need to build the evidence base.

Intervention and Study Design Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Most Frequent Interventions by Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KQ1: What effective interventions/strategies exist to improve access to oral health care for the I/DD population?</td>
<td>- Prevention strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KQ2: What effect do interventions that support good oral health behaviors have on improved oral health care for the I/DD population?</td>
<td>- Sedation use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Education &amp; behavioral strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Access &amp; potential models of care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17% of studies operationalized the definition of I/DD (defined by IQ, standardized test or diagnosis)
21% of the study samples were adults only, 34% were adults and children
35% of the studies were conducted in the United States, followed by Japan, Brazil and the UK

Study Designs by Topic: 27% of all studies were RCT/RCT w/Cross-over

Study Quality
Overall 40% of studies were rated as "good."

Quality review was based on a series of questions relating to study and sample design, proper measurement, validity of variables, data analysis, bias and relevance to clinical practice.
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